

STAT

Approved For Release 2003/06/25 : CIA-RDP85-00988R000500050022-9

EXCOM MATERIAL

27 June 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Committee Members

STAT

FROM : [REDACTED]
Special Assistant to the DDCISUBJECT : Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting,
18 June 1980

1. The Executive Committee met on 18 June 1980 to review and reach decisions on the SIS award allocation system and several other personnel topics. Mr. Carlucci chaired the session; participants included Messrs. McMahon (DDO), Clarke (D/NFAC), Wortman (DDA), Taylor (ADDS&T), Lipton (Compt.), [REDACTED] (D/DCI/RMS), Briggs (IG), and Fitzwater (Vice Chairman, E Career Service/D/OPPPM). (AIUO)

2. Mr. Fitzwater asked the Committee to consider whether current Agency policy regarding Quality Step Increases (QSIs) should be reaffirmed or revised. The question surfaced because of the recent high volume of QSI recommendations and differences in interpretation of current QSI policy. He explained that OPPPM interprets the criteria in the 1962 legislation authorizing QSIs -- "Sustained high quality performance" -- as requiring at least an overall 6 rating in the current Performance Appraisal Report. People in PRA status are not considered eligible. Components, however, have been recommending people with overall 5 ratings, usually on the basis of a single noteworthy achievement, as well as people in PRA status. Mr. Clarke outlined NFAC's rationale for appealing a recent OPPPM disapproval of a QSI recommendation. After some discussion, the Committee reaffirmed current QSI policy, noting that incentive awards are the appropriate mechanisms for rewarding singular achievements. The DDCI requested OPPPM, however, to review the adequacy of incentive award policy and levels. OPPPM should appropriately publicize both the QSI and incentive award systems. (AIUO)

3. Noting the low rate of response to OPPPM's request for line review of Recruitment Guides and for projections of expected component vacancies, Mr. Fitzwater urged members to have their components provide the necessary information. The DDCI reinforced the OPPPM plea. (AIUO)

4. Mr. Fitzwater then briefed the Committee on the SIS sabbatical policy approved by the DDCI on 30 May. A discussion ensued. Later in the meeting, the DDCI concurred with Mr. Clarke's suggestion that OPPPM revise the sabbatical policy to make it consistent with the SIS decision stating that people on developmental or training assignments (including sabbaticals) will be considered for SIS performance awards. (AIUO)

ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY

0130 2330

ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY

5. The Committee then reviewed OPPPM's Issues Paper on the SIS Performance Award Program (previously distributed as attachment to EXCOM 9076-80, 12 June 1980). A summary of the discussion and decisions reached follows:

o Issue 1, Boards and panels.

Decision: Option C — Boards and panels will be required to make recommendations for awards and stipends.

o Issue 2, Organizational evaluation as a factor in allocating awards.

Discussion: Awards will be allocated to the Directorates and the DCI area on a pro rata basis with the DCI/DDCI maintaining a reserve, tentatively about 15 percent, to be used to correct any inequities and to serve as incentives for unusually deserving components.

Decision: Option C — Awards will be allocated on the basis of a combination of individual performance and organizational evaluation.

o Issue 3, Structure of allocations and establishing a DCI/DDCI reserve.

Discussion: In response to Mr. Taylor's comment, Mr. Fitzwater said that the issue of DDS&T's supergrade ceiling would be resolved.

Decision: Option A — Allocate awards to the Directorate Deputy Directors and the DCI area based on 50 percent of their total on-duty strength for SIS-1, 2, 3 and 4 and establish a DCI/DDCI reserve.

o Issue 4, Who approves awards?

Discussion: The DCI/ DDCI, not the Chairman of the E Career Service, will make relevant decisions for E Career Service SIS members, based on recommendations submitted by the independent office/staff heads.

Decision: Option B — The DCI/DDCI exercises final approval authority for all SIS awards (based on recommendations from the Career Services).

ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY

- o Issue 5, Who initiates awards action on officers transferred during the rating period?

Decision: Option B — The current rating officer.

- o Issue 6, How should awards for officers from one Career Service serving in another Directorate be charged?

Discussion: To provide positive incentives for rotation, neither the host Directorate nor the people on rotation should be penalized.

Decision: Option C — Provide Directorates with a separate award allocation for noncareerists, with any unused portion reverting to the DCI/DDCI reserve. (Directorate on-duty strength figures will be adjusted appropriately.)

- o Issue 7, How should awards for officers from one Career Service serving in another Directorate be considered?

Decision: Option A — Current supervisor initiates awards recommendation which is considered by the host Directorate chain of command.

- o Issue 8, Procedures/considerations for officers on (a) developmental assignments, (b) promoted to SIS during the reporting period, or (c) retiring during the reporting period.

Discussion: A fourth special category should be added to cover officers serving on detail outside the Agency. Panels will be responsible for ensuring officers in all four categories are appropriately considered for awards.

Decision: Option A — Provide full consideration to SIS officers in each category.

- o Issue 9, Should recipients of stipends also receive performance awards?

Discussion: Because of the salary ceilings, recipients will not realize the full monetary benefit of receiving both awards. If SIS members are nominated for stipends, but do not receive them, they will receive performance awards.

Decision: Option B — Stipend recipients will not receive performance awards.

o Issue 10, Paperwork required.

Discussion: Mr. Clarke suggested that OPPPM revise the recommendation award form.

Decision: Option A -- Limit additional paperwork to an awards recommendation form and a memorandum for rank stipends.

o Issue 11, Publicity.

Discussion: Cover concerns and IG concerns regarding potential complaints argue against publicity.

Decision: Option B — Provide publicity on the awards program procedures, but do not publish the names of award and stipend recipients.

o Issue 12, Who will present the awards?

Decision: Option B — The DCI/DDCI will present all performance awards (by letter). (AIUO)

6. Mr. Carlucci adjourned the meeting. (AIUO)



cc: D/DCI/RMS
D/OPPPM
IG
Chairman, E Career Service

STAT

~~SECRET~~

EXCOM 9072-80

25X1

Approved For Release 2003/06/26 : CIA-RDP85-00888R000500050022-9

Director of Logistics

29 May 1980

EXCOM MATERIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence
Deputy Director of Administration
Deputy Director for National Foreign Assessment
Deputy Director for Science and Technology
Deputy Director for Operations
Comptroller

25X1

FROM : [REDACTED]
Special Assistant to the DDCI

SUBJECT : Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting,
22 May 1980

1. The Executive Committee met on 22 May 1980 to continue its review of the proposed FY 1982 Program. Mr. Carlucci chaired the session; Messrs. McMahon (DDO), Wortman (DDA), Hineman (DDNFAC), Dirks (DDS&T), and Lipton (Compt.) attended; and Messrs. Stein (ADDO), Hart (ADDA), Taylor (ADDS&T), and several members of the Comptroller's staff participated as observers. [REDACTED]

25X1

2. Noting that Mr. Lipton had provided members material reflecting revisions agreed to at the first program review session, Mr. Carlucci asked for any additional suggestions. In response to Mr. Wortman's comments, the Committee agreed to move [REDACTED] subsidy just outside zero growth, making it Decision Package 112. Mr. Carlucci then led the group through a review of the alternative strategies outlined on pages 93-95 of the proposed program plan, eliciting views on the pros and cons of each. After some discussion, the Committee concurred that the proposed strategy was preferable. Mr. Lipton asked about moving the Career Trainee packages, and it was agreed to move these (139 and 140) ahead of the theme packages. In response to Mr. Carlucci's question, Mr. Lipton explained how funds for covert action had been ranked. [REDACTED]

25X1

25X1

3. The Committee agreed to submit the proposed program with the modifications that had been suggested during the two review sessions. The need to obtain zero plus 7 to 10 percent growth to meet Agency needs was reiterated throughout the two sessions. In its discussion to determine where to end the recommended program submission, the Committee agreed on the following:

25X1

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2003/06/26 : CIA-RDP85-00988R000500050022-9

OL O 2486

25X1

Approved For Release 2003/06/26 : CIA-RDP85-00988R000500050022-9

Approved For Release 2003/06/26 : CIA-RDP85-00988R000500050022-9